

to borrow to spend more than we take in, to inflate, that is, cheapen, our money, inflation again hurts most those in the lower income groups.

Challenge on fiscal responsibility: The minority report on the Housing bill, prepared by Republican Members, points it up as a clear-cut challenge to the Congress on the question of fiscal responsibility. The minority said, "Even the title of the bill—Emergency Home Ownership Act—condemns this proposal. There simply is no emergency. Last year our economy and the well-being of our people moved to new highs. Virtually all competent observers agree that this year will be even better. And yet, under this bill, a billion dollar back-door raid would be made on the Treasury for the purchase of mortgages at subsidy prices. In this time of prosperity, fiscal responsibility requires that the Congress achieve a noninflationary Federal budget. Irresponsible spending proposals of this type must be stopped."

New housing starts are not the whole picture. In considering the role of housing in our economy, one important fact should not be overlooked. New housing construction is only one part of the picture. People also become homeowners by buying existing houses and get better homes by expenditures for renovation. A breakdown of the \$15 billion in loans made by member institutions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board last year shows only a third of that money borrowed for new home construction. The rest of it went into purchases of existing houses and for repair and remodeling. The banks were playing a housing-starts number game by alluding to only one part of the picture in presenting the Housing bill.

Indiana Congressman CHARLIE HALLECK, Republican leader, summed the thing up pretty succinctly stating, "The bill represents a billion dollars worth of baloney." Needless to say, the bill cleared the House by a vote of 234 to 163. Should the Senate pass it as well, it faces an almost certain presidential veto, but will remain very much alive as an election issue.

Figures in last week's newsletter: Last week the figure for the foreign aid bureaucracy was given as 12,500 people; actually, the foreign aid program gives employment to more than 50,000 people, a figure I hope, desperately, we can reduce.

Military Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Anthony Harrigan of the Charleston News and Courier—America's most independent newspaper—has written an excellent article titled "Military Leadership." His splendid article, appearing in the Charleston News and Courier under date of May 1, 1960, calls the attention of the Nation to the magnificent contribution our military leaders have made to freedom and in keeping the America safe.

When this world witnesses the mistakes this Nation has made on the advice of certain civilians in the diplomatic field, the Nation should thank God for its military statesmen.

The article follows:

MILITARY LEADERSHIP

(By Anthony Harrigan)

It used to be said that war is too serious a business to be left to the generals. But nowadays it seems that the military mind offers the best hope of this world-embattled Nation.

It is the generals and the admiral-men such as Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, former Army Chief of Staff; Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. C. F. Cabell, USAF, Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency—who are helping the Nation face the totality of Communist aggression.

These men study the threat to the national security—it is their profession—and know how the enemy works from the Caribbean to the China Sea.

In refreshing contrast to the State Department's refusal to face the facts in Cuba is the statement of General Cabell in an appearance before Senate Committee on the Judiciary that "collaboration with and infiltration of popular movements, for example that of Batista in the 1930's and of Castro in the 1950's—has been communism's most effective weapon in Latin America."

General Cabell boldly stated that the "so-called national liberation strategy seeks to offset Communist numerical and political weakness through international organizational support and clandestine techniques of infiltration and coordination."

Military leaders like General Cabell are trying, in the face of foolish talk of coexistence, to explain to the American public how this Nation is at war and that the hour is late for counterattacks against the enemy.

One hopes that the American public will listen carefully to the statements of these military men. They serve as pathfinders and guides to the American people that must make transitions in thought and action in the years ahead.

The counsel of the military is in marked contrast to the unrealistic discussions of those civilian elements who urge disarmament and coexistence and who would block U.S. action by spreading fear of a nuclear holocaust.

The appearance of Castro, the H-bomb, protest marchers, the advocates of recognition of Red China, the friends of vast U.S. financed United Nations programs (as a substitute for military defenses) are all of one mind. They would have the United States accept coexistence with the Communist enemy and not passively and appeasingly before Red imperialism.

The American people should ignore the counsel of passivity before a terrible threat. They should remember George Washington's advice "to choose peace or war as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel."

The military leaders of the United States understand that this Nation cannot win the war with communism by thinking or acting with passivity. They know that conflict cannot be avoided by any treaty, any scrap of paper or verbal agreement with the Soviet enemy. Conflict is the history of mankind. It is the history of our own time. We haven't the option now to choose whether or not we want war; we have it—and fight in our own hemisphere.

Edmund S. Whitman, vice president of the United Fruit Co., an American company whose properties in Cuba were recently confiscated for Soviet-style collectives, has said:

"The international Communist conspiracy in the Western Hemisphere acts like the buzzards. The disciplined agents from Moscow hover over a country waiting for it to soften up to a point where they can move in and devour it . . . The disciplined foreign agents know how to roll with the punch. Their ring tactics are highly flexible. Thus, when a movement by force fails, they adopt

the Trojan horse strategy. That is the stratagem the free world is confronted with today."

Thus it is absurd for civilian officials to talk about avoiding all war. The task of true national leaders is not to run from conflict but to strengthen the will to win. They also have the task of shaping national policy in such a way that the outcome of the protracted war with communism will be favorable to the United States.

The transitions in thought and action that the military can help the American public make are from absurdity to realism in foreign relations.

American ideas about national conflict are vague and lacking in realism. The American approach to foreign relations is that peace and disarmament is a natural among nations. Many, however, have the unsound notion that because various countries have their own goals that all nations are morally equal. That such determination is a basic right of the United States should respect in all its spheres.

This is wrong. Castro's Cuba is not deserving of the same kind of respect as Canada. Neither is national self-determination in Castro's Cuba, where a Communist-front regime controls, as valid as it is in England.

That every people has the right to choose its own kind of government, to go its own way—as in Castro's case forging links with Red China and the U.S.S.R.—is a notion that handicaps the United States in its struggle to preserve freedom against Communist tyranny. It is this notion that leave the United States unable to decide between the claims of an old friend and a new nation.

The Algerian situation is a case in point. The peculiar idea prevails that the Algerian rebels, who accepted aid from Red China's military advisers and who engage in terrorism, are deserving of no less consideration than France, a pillar of Western civilization.

Too often a spurious moralism becomes involved in national policy as a result of foolish ideas about the sovereignty and rights of foreign states. War becomes in this view, a way to protect rights that are illusory.

Thus, after World War I President Wilson considered not U.S. strategic needs but the alleged rights of various Balkan peoples. At the conclusion of World War II, the same error was repeated.

America's Dutch allies were forced out of the East Indies. The result was a Japanese Government that is leftist and no ally of the United States. The spurious moralism resulted in denial of military aid to Chiang Kai-shek with the harrowing result of the loss of free China to world communism.

Unprincipled, pseudo-moralistic aims have been the undoing of the United States since World War II. The only cautionary force in the United States have been the professional military people. The determination to hold Formosa stemmed from the military insistence on its necessity. The Panama Canal Zone is still under firm U.S. control because the military regard it as essential. Spain is a free world bastion, no longer scorned by the U.S. Government because the military know its importance for air and naval bases. And Cuba may be liberated from Castro because the Navy considers its Guantanamo base of too great importance to lose.

America's best military minds share the idea that Prime Minister Palmerston once enunciated, namely that "England has no permanent friends; England has only permanent interests." If the United States keeps its eyes on its strategic interests, leaving aside other considerations, it will be able to resist Communist attack.

Despite good counsel from the military, U.S. opinion is still a captive of the one-worlders, the coexisters, and the America